

# Meeting of the Collaborative Research, Assessments & Monitoring to Inform Ecosystem-Based Management Working Group

Notes from August 24, 2009 Conference Call (10 – 11 am)

In attendance: Terrie Klinger, Joe Schumacker, Fan Tsao, Diane Butorac, Rob Jones, Joe Gilbertson, Steve Joner, Gary Greene, Sam Johnson, Greg Bargmann, Eric Wilkins, Jennifer Hagen, Jennifer Hennessey, Jody Kennedy, Barbara Hickey, Sue Thomas, Ed Bowlby, Liam Antrim, George Galasso, Lauren Bennett, and John Barimo.

## Notes & Action Items

1. Ed has compiled a master distribution list for members; he will add contact information and circulate
2. No amendments to the previous meeting notes
3. Terrie – Task of group is to recommend actions for next 5-10 yrs. Prioritized items for variable funding. See California sanctuary management plans for reference (<http://sanctuaries.noaa.gov/management/mpr/welcome.html>)
4. Data needs and questionnaire summary
  - a. Terrie – define what's necessary and realistic for OCNMS. Current version of summary reflects all contributions but it will be pared down to reduce redundancies. General discussion will be followed by requesting individuals with specific expertise to determine what items are most relevant
  - b. Fan – list huge and all encompassing, needs prioritization
  - c. Barb – yes, huge list, prioritize
  - d. Greg – struggled with the list. What questions do we need to answer, what are the threats, and then we should determine what data is needed. E.g., why measure pH? What does such a measure provide toward management application?
  - e. Rob – agreed. Our focus is research and monitoring to support EBM. What is EBM going to look like in 5-10 yrs? How to understand the ecosystem? Then what data are needed? What data are already collected and what can OCNMS do to contribute?
  - f. Joe G – Agreed, how data are applied to Mgmt for prioritization. Found the CA Atlantis model helpful.
  - g. Terrie – Need to continue building robust partnerships. In this exercise, priorities should address needs of OCNMS mgmt authorities
  - h. Barb – Current list is too big to fund
  - i. Joe G. – Need to consider at non-charismatic megafauna
  - j. Terrie – If a fisheries mgmt plan exists for a species, then responsible agencies collect that data, i.e., fisheries data. We can make recommendations to strengthen partnerships, but it is not realistic to recommend that OCNMS begin to collect fisheries data
  - k. Joe S. – No fisheries data (I don't think the OCNMS wants to conduct trawl surveys which NMFS currently does in those areas.)
  - l. Greg – ID data needs, then see who has or will get data, then ID gaps
  - m. Terrie – Exactly
  - n. Terrie – next step to refine list. Which parameters monitored, by whom, spatial extent and frequency. Then how likely to measure those parameters.
  - o. Ed – people should look at the OCNMS Condition Report which already tried to ID indicator or key species. Indicators, bio and physical. (see: <http://sanctuaries.noaa.gov/science/condition/ocnms/welcome.html>)

- p. Terrie – So which are high or low level indicators?
- q. George – Condition Report is intended to inform MPR process
- r. Terrie – we can consider data to inform next Condition Report
- s. Gary - All comments good. Likes indicator species. Mappers like to hang things on a place, base map products are helpful
- t. Joe S – Agreed. Mapping and characterization a priority
- u. Terrie – Atlantis model includes spatial habitat component used dynamically. This is appropriate research for sanctuary.
- v. Gary – mapping done to some extent through WA State Seafloor mapping group(see [http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/ocean/pdf/WA\\_seafloor\\_proceedings\\_final.pdf](http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/ocean/pdf/WA_seafloor_proceedings_final.pdf)). Can share info to make easier.
- w. Sam – also the West Coast Governors agreement has seafloor mapping plan for supporting material; see <http://westcoastoceans.gov/action/>
- x. Jennifer Hennessey – Washington state will look for partnerships, agencies that align in state focus on seafloor mapping.
- y. Ed – unfortunately Nancy Wright, OCNMS habitat mapping specialist, is in the field but OCNMS has ID mapping priorities with other partners and we are making slow progress.
- z. Sam – new avenues for funding. Intent to jointly lobby for federal funds, partners. OCNMS could be part of this larger effort.
- aa. Terrie - Charge – Need help with specific items for your expertise. Will send out a new iteration of the long summary list with specific questions. Are parameters measured now? If not, who would do? Focus on your expertise areas. For example Mapping could be Gary Greene, Sam Johnson, Jennifer Hennessey, & Nancy; MCBI can help with carbonate system; Physical Oceanography would be Barb and perhaps Jan.
- bb. Barb - There is a new \$300 million NSF mooring rig funded by economic stimulus money for Washington shelf. Not sure if mooring is within OCNMS. She'll find out about location. There will be 3 long term moorings with fluorometers, nutrient sensors, etc. OSU has the contract to deploy and maintain moorings.
- cc. Jennifer Hennessey –What is the time frame for data collection from these new moorings?.
- dd. Barb – thinks it's 3 yrs. Large scale physical data relevant to sanctuary does not need to come from measurements within OCNMS, even northern CA data can be applied to OCNMS for processes such as salinity to temperature. Some biology nearshore may need more localized measurements. OCNMS is one little piece of the California Current Ecosystem (CCE), which is the overriding engine driving processes.
- ee. Ed – OCNMS & CA sanctuaries are plugged into the CCE
- ff. Barb – annual newsletter on the state of the CCE gives trends **Action – Barb to send newsletter to Ed**
- gg. Sam – quarterly CCE release. PaCOOS? This NOAA report is coordinated out of Scripps
- hh. Joe S – Need this feedback for existing data, need links
- ii. Terrie – This group needs to ID partnerships and ID data resources
- jj. Barb- NSF changed requirements for National Archives submission of oceanographic data. Increased pressure by withholding funds till supplied.
- kk. Susan – seabird perspective. Final draft manual of seabirds of CCE in preparation. Updates on species status going out for review shortly. Also new funding to resume seabird colony counts by helicopter. Will make a note to circulate this upon request from Terrie

- ll. **Ed – Action Items – 1) Follow up on comments by Sam and Barb re: CCE links. 2) Distribute expanded table of past and present research and monitoring in the sanctuary.**
- mm. Terrie – There is an interest at the national levels of ONMS HQ and region to use sanctuaries as sentinel sites to measure climate change. No concrete plans or funding, but real interest. Interest extends beyond ONMS to other parts of NOAA. Maybe will mature over next 5 yrs.
- nn. Sam – is reviewing docs of CBNMS and GFNMS on climate change and wondering if OCNMS is also generating one.
- oo. Terrie – not sure, but regional products could apply across all 5 west coast sanctuaries
- pp. **George – Action Item – Aware of work. Will report to working group if there is regional activity.**
- qq. Terrie – other comments before close?
- rr. Joe S – 2 other comments received, will be part of compilation. Comfortable with asking for work in their fields of expertise and prioritizing. Everyone comfortable?
- ss. Ed – housekeeping – Is everyone comfortable with circulating names, phone numbers and email addresses? It may appear on the website
- tt. George- Last Friday there was a meeting of the conservation working group and they identified areas of potential overlap with the CRAM group. Overlap is being encouraged
- uu. Joe S – was on call with group and saw benefit of cross pollination
- vv. Terrie – next call falls on Labor Day. Propose changing to either Tue Sep 8<sup>th</sup> at 10am or Mon Sep 14<sup>th</sup> at 10am.
- ww. Rob- PFMC will be meeting Sep 14<sup>th</sup>, so the 8<sup>th</sup> is better
- xx. Terrie – will be sending out a new version of the survey then request input from experts
- yy. George – Re: time course for working group: it is hoped that Advisory Council working groups finish by end of calendar year and pass recommendation at Nov 08 or Jan 09 AC meetings
- zz. Terrie – hope to finish by Christmas, especially regarding expert input. Vision not to task members with large amounts of writing. OCNMS and AC members take on burden of writing. We will convene face-to-face meetings if necessary but otherwise by phone and emails for now.
- aaa. Joe S- Return latest version of questionnaire before next meeting